[Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy]

incentives to the mill owners also. All these things are there. O. K. But, at the same time, we have to see what concrete measures the Government is going to take to give relief to the cane growers. That is not being considered at all. Of course, every year you are announcing some increase by one rupee or two rupees or five rupees. But that is not going to solve the problem of the farmers or the growers. So, you have to prepare a permanent plan, you have to chalk out a permanent plan, so that the conditions of the growers can be improved. As my other friends have suggested, in order to put an end to the exploitation of the farmers by the mill owners, the best thing would be to nationalise all the sugar mills and make them modern so that abundant sugar is available to the consumer and the sugarcane growers also get remunerative prices.

Now, there is an increase in sugar production in the country and the Minister also has said that in his statement. We welcome that and we are very happy about it. At the same time, I would like to point out here, we are importing a large quantity of sugar from abroad costing huge foreign exchange. We are sorry about it. I would like to know from the honourable Minister when the country will be self-sufficient in sugar so that we can avoid importing sugar from the other countries. I would like to know when this would become possible and what measures the Government is going to take in this direction.

In the end, Sir, ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please conclude now.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: In the end, Sir, I would like to request the honourable Minister to take all possible measures to come to the aid of the sugarcane growers so that their conditions may become better, their children and other family members may live in better conditions and they can lead a peaceful life. Thank you, Sir.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: GOVERNMENT BUSINESS FOR THE WEEK COMMENCING 30th NOVEMBER 1987

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business in this House during the week commencing 30th November, 1987, will consist of the consideration and passing of the following Bills:-

(1) the Auroville (Emergency Provisions) Amendment Bill, 1987 as passed by Lok Sabha.

(2) The Railway Claims Tribunal Bill, 1987 as passed by Lok Sabha.

(3) The Merchant Shipping (Second Amendment) Bill, 1987.

(4) The Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Bill, 1987.

(5) The Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Amendment Bill, 1987 as passed by Lok Sabha.

(6) The National Housing Bank Bill, 1987 as passed by Lok Sabha.

(7) The High Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Amendment Bill, 1987 as passed by Lok Sabha.

(8) The Cine Workers and Cinema Theatre Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Bill, 1987.

(9) The Regional Rural Banks (Amendment) Bill, 1987 as passed by Lok Sabha.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The House stands adjourned for lunch, to meet again at 2.30 p.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at sixteen minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-two minutes past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) in the Chair.

RESOLUTION RE:) AM-) AND) ACT, 1976—Contd

SHRI VEERSHETTY MOGLAPPA KUSHNOOR (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, last time I was referring to some of the views of the eminent personalities and even of the Supreme Court Judges. I am again quoting the Supreme Court Judge, Mr. Tulzapurkar's view about this Act while delivering his judgement, he said that this Act of the year 1976, the Urban Ceiling Act, is ill-conceived and ill-drafted and its provisions have misfired and produced results opposite of what was intended. This is the view of the Supreme Court Judge which I have quoted last time also. When this Act was passed in 1976, several questions were raised in Parliament within three years. After that, a Working Group was appointed in the year 1979 to find out whether this Act which has been passed is being implemented properly or there are any deficiencies in this Act and if there are deficiencies, then how to remove those deficiencies. This Working Group submitted its report in the year 1980. Sir, the then Works and Housing Minister, Mr. Sethi stated about the implementation of this Act on 18th March 1980:

> "The Urban Land Ceiling Act, in its present shape, had proved an obstacle in the way of building activities. The non-availability of land at reasonable prices in the urban areas was one of the major factors inhibiting the taking up of housing programmes up to the desired level."

This was the view in the year 1980 and the Act was passed in 1976. Again in the year 1981, the then Works and Housing Minister, Mr. Bhishma Narain Singh, also expressed the same opinion saying that the Government is intending to bring an amendment to this Act and wanted to change the entire Act also. After that, I do not know why the Government, even after deciding in the year 1980, even after expressing the same view in 1981, could not bring any legislation. In the year 1982, the then Deputy Works and Housing Minister, Mr. Brij Mohan Mohanti, told the Lok Sabha during the Question Hour that the Government is seriously thinking of bringing amendments in this Act. But even after 1982 also, nothing was done in this Act. The position continued, even till today, no amendments have been brought in this Act. Even on 13th November, 1982 Mr. H. K. L. Bhagat, who was at that time the Minister for Housing and Works, also expressed that the Government was bringing legislation to replace this Act and far-reaching amendments would be brought. Not only that, Sir, On 5th July, 1984, Mr. Buta Singh, while addressing the Consultative Committee also promised that "we are taking action to bring the amendments in this Act." But succesively nothing has happened. Why I am bringing this to the notice of the hon. House is that everybody is satisfied and everybody is convinced that this Act, after it was passed, has not brought any changes. Sir, why is this Act so defective? It is because the Act has been passed hurriedly. In the Parliament and outside even in the State Legislatures at that time there was a strong urge, and the people have been urging the Central Government and the State Governments that for the sake of land reforms you are taking away the farmers' lands but you are not touching the lands of the big landlords, big fellows in the cities and, therefore, you must bring an Act to take away the surplus lands from the big people. Therefore, in 1976, hurriedly this Act was passed and there were a large number of loopholes. I think, Mr. Deshmukh has rightly pointed out that there are a large number of loopholes which have to be plugged or a new Act has to be brought in. Sir, even the Prime Minister on 28th February,